

Western Carolinian.

It is even wise to abstain from laws, which however wise and good in themselves, have the semblance of inequality which find no response in the heart of the citizen, and which will be evaded with little remorse.
Dr. Channing.

[BY JOHN BEARD, JR.]

SALISBURY, ROWAN COUNTY, N. C. MONDAY JULY 15, 1839.

[VOL. XIV. NO. 684.]

TERMS.

The WESTERN CAROLINIAN is published once a week at two dollars per annum, if paid within three months; or two dollars and fifty cents, if paid at any other time within the year. No Paper will be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, unless at the Editor's discretion. No subscription will be received for a less time than one year.

A failure to notify the Editor of a wish to discontinue, one month before the expiration of a year, will be considered as a new engagement.

Any person procuring six solvent subscribers to the Carolinian, shall have a month paper gratis.—Advertising at the usual rates.

All letters addressed to the Editor must be paid for, or they will not be attended to. These terms will be strictly adhered to.

From the Raleigh Register.
OUR STATE CONSTITUTION.
NO. VI.

"All political power is vested in and derived from the people only."

Bill of Rights.

To the Editors:

I have already shown that our Constitution was framed at a period when any attempt to defeat it would have been disastrous to Liberty, and by a body of men (how ever pure their intentions were)—who had no power from the People to establish it—that these men were probably influenced by a necessity to accommodate some of its features to the customs of the country and the divisions of our people. I have proved that they did not impose any limits on the right of the People to reform it when the circumstances of the country should render it safe as well as desirable—that such a limitation was purposely omitted, with a view to quiet all party and avoid a strife that might be ruinous to the cause of Independence. I have demonstrated as plainly as figures will prove any thing, that a majority of the People, and they who support the Government of North Carolina, do not administer its affairs.—I have stated for the consideration of your readers some of the public evils which have sprung from this unequal representation. These are an example of those evils which exceed the revenue and have

which must soon end in bankruptcy, or the imposition of higher taxes on a majority to pay the minority for their misrule; an unwholesome & expensive legislation; sectional party spirit and geographical divisions among our legislators; and a growing diffusion of this dangerous influence among the People at large. I have pointed out how one man, in one part of North Carolina, has more weight in its councils than 7 men in another, or 6 in another, or 5 in another, &c. That the people of 21 counties pay those of 43 to rule over them; and that they of 20 counties do not contribute towards the revenue a sum equal to the taxes received by their equals, and a fair proportion of the cost of preparing and printing the edicts which they promulgate for the government of the people. That the third, govern and tax two thirds of the people of the State.—That the people are taxed by those whom they cannot call to account for their conduct. That one portion of them pay the taxes which another expend. And now let me ask you, Why are these things permitted to be so? I call for an answer. These are not evils which rest upon the bare assertion of any one man or set of men. They are not the suggestions of party enthusiasm. They are sober truths, susceptible of the clearest proof, and made plain to the humblest capacity. Let me therefore repeat the enquiry, Why are they allowed to continue? If the opposers of Reform act manfully, and speak out the real truth, they must tell you, that they can be maintained for no other purpose than to preserve the Power of a majority and to perpetuate a denial of rights to a MAJORITY of the people. Therefore there has been some faint denial that these evils exist, but they have gone on to increase in their magnitude until now no man who has any regard for his character will deny their existence. Yet the Representatives of the people have obstinately refused a remedy. They who represent a majority, have proposed that, under the direction of lawful authority, the People might be required to vote "for or against a Convention," and that such a body of delegates might be convened if a majority of the people voted for it; but this has been rejected. They have at other times submitted the plan of calling a Convention, to be limited to the consideration of such parts of our Constitution as are a source of just complaint, but this too has been refused. They have then submitted specific amendments (embracing a compromise of right to the prejudices and ill grounded fears of a minority) and demanded that a Convention call for the single purpose of considering these amendments, and authorized to do no more than to adopt or reject them, but this too they have been defeated. They have prepared specific amendments (embracing alike compromise, and invited their opponents to put all proper and safe checks upon the dreaded power of a majority) and proposed to put these to the direct vote of the People to accept or reject them en masse, but here again, they have been assailed by a violent opposition which has suspended this demand. They have again and again called on their opponents (whose candor obliged them to admit their grievances) to devise any other mode of redress—but here also they have been destined to meet with disappointment. I cannot enter into a full consideration of the pretexts upon which these repeated demands have been refused, and at times most contemptuously scouted, by a refusal even to debate them. It ought to be sufficient that there are no good reasons why they shall be any longer denied, but there are many unanswerable reasons for yielding justice—while those who have been heretofore refused it, are willing to take even less than strict right entitles them to exact.—He must be a very careless observer of his own government and of the operation of things in this State, who has not perceived that before many years have passed over our head, these inequalities in our Constitution must and WILL BE REMOVED. A change in our unequal system of representation is demanded by every principle of justice in a free Government. It is impossible to meet it, but by a denial of the right of the people to GOVERN THEMSELVES. A fair and equal representation, where it is withheld for a long time, invites, may force a struggle for rights which is sanctioned by public opinion all over the world.—The House of Lords in Great Britain resisted its approach on them, until the very existence of their government was threatened, when the KING was forced to dissolve the Parliament, and leave this question to the people, declaring, "that whatever should be the will of the people, HE was bound to obey." The General Assembly of North Carolina ought not to be less obedient to the will of the people; and persevering resistance to that will cannot be less hazardous in free America, than in the dominions of a Monarch. Let it be remembered, that when I speak of dangers to the State, I am not silly enough to be thinking of bloodshed and civil war. We may have commotions without spilling of blood; we may have dangerous experiments upon our liberty and upon the permanency of our free institutions in this country, without the breaking of necks, or strangling, or hanging outstretched. The resolutions may prompt us to withhold justice and deny rights, until the affections of our people shall be weaned from the State—until they will be induced to assert their claims by a Convention not authorized by a previous law, but deriving its existence and its powers directly from a majority of the people. Are you ready to prove that such a course would not be effectual? Are you prepared to demonstrate that such a step would be obnoxious to the principles of our Government? Are the minority of North Carolina blind to the consequences of that course into which they are forcing the majority? I am far, very far, from desiring to see this experiment tried. The Government of this country have had trials enough in one generation. I wish to see no such test applied to their permanency and stability. It has dangers which I need not depict to you, and which I heartily deprecate. But remember that a people who have been long denied their rights, who have unsuccessfully made all the proposals that are consistent with the practice and theory of free Governments in this country, are not the most prudent calculators of consequences when they are contending for that which they have inherited in common with their brethren, but which they are yet denied the enjoyment of—EQUAL RIGHTS.

The friends of Reform have now taken what we know to be the last step before they reach that perilous height which I have hinted at. If they fail here, they are left no other alternative but to SUBMIT, or resort to the exercise of the high but dangerous privilege of ORIGINATING a Convention among themselves by the vote of a majority. What then, is the part of wisdom and patriotism? They have applied to the Legislature in vain for more than 20 years; as their evils have increased, they have repeated their demands. Now, they have turned with confidence to the PEOPLE, and invoked their attention to these things. They have appealed from the SERVANTS of the Republic to the SOVEREIGNS of the State, and no man can feel indifferent to the answer that this appeal shall find, for none can be uninterested in its consequences. The result ought not to prove, that a large portion of North Carolina are prepared to repudiate the maxim of American freedom, that "in a State, the majority must govern." Our history ought never to record that they, whose fathers were first to defy the power of a tyrant, are willing to renounce their confidence in the capacity and virtue of the people, and their allegiance to the rights of self government; or, that they despise the ancient boast of our free institutions, that "every inequality may be removed and all their evils may be cured by the peaceable action of the public will." Nor is this all. If this appeal is rejected, and the representatives elected by a minority of the people are to be cheered with the

plaudit "well done good and faithful servants," to persevere in a denial of RIGHTS to a majority—poor old North Carolina may be destined to present the spectacle of a people raised to put in practice the most dangerous experiment our country has ever endured; but one, which, I think, it will puzzle the most ingenious politician among us to prove, is not sanctioned by our BILL OF RIGHTS and the principles of our Government—I would rather hope, but I dare not trust myself to believe, that this majority will sooner submit. Let us do justice, and avert the possibility of such an evil. A majority of the people who are accustomed to study the principles of their government, and have been long contending against injustice, may not be patient after having exhausted all other means of getting an equal share in the Government, and they will not halt at fears of danger when they have once resolved not to submit. More than once or twice have I heard it urged upon the consideration of this majority, "not to despair, for they had the right and the power to ORIGINATE a Convention and redress themselves." I am greatly deceived, if it was not designed to press these things upon the attention of the people in 1823, when a Convention was held in Raleigh by the representatives of those who have been so long excluded from a fair share in the government of the State; I may indeed be mistaken, for I cannot speak ex cathedra, but I have reasons to think it was so, and that the design was not carried into execution, because the public attention soon after it became so much engrossed by the Presidential Election. The inequalities of our representation are now much greater than they were at that day—the temper of reform is now much milder—the concessions which are now offered are more liberal; consequently, a refusal to accede to them will be much more offensive. Hence too, the majority are less likely to submit to any refusal to do them justice and the minority will be less excusable for such a course. For one, I say then let these things be settled—and in my judgment, (however honest his purpose may be) that man is blind to the interest of North Carolina, as well as indifferent to the demands of the most ordinary equity, who will any longer withhold his assent to a just compromise of this galling question.

I know that there are some among your readers who will exclaim, "What forsooth, does this scribbler expect to alarm me into his terms?" No my good sir, say I to any such—I seek not any thing of the sort. But those who love the State more than their party—those who are not too proud to be wise, and would take a sober view of the probable effects of withholding an admitted right—who are Statesmen and not political coxcombs, may find, I think, in these things subjects for reflection and arguments to convince them. Rest assured they are not meant for you my high mettled friend.

If an agent were called on to account and surrender his power of Attorney, and he refused it upon the vain pretext that his principal had accompanied his demand with an intimation that obstinate refusal would compel him to demand the surrender by suit, would it be a good answer for a faithful agent?—"I will give nothing though it be just, because you have dared to let me know I might ultimately be forced to do it?"

If a man has come into possession of another's property by accident, in a time of common danger, can he honestly withhold it from the true owner, upon the pretence that he is justified, because the owner will not go on his knees and humbly beseech him to restore it? Shall he pray for it seventy times seven, and will not seven times answer the pride of his neighbor? Alas how long must it be true, that men will perpetrate injustice in their political relations, which they would scorn to practice in the private relations of life? If a partnership is formed in trade, and after its continuance for 50 years, two thirds of the partners do not furnish funds sufficient to cover their own expenses and the other third are yearly sinking their capital in defraying these expenses—would it be considered just in that two thirds, to refuse the entreaties of their partners to consent to diminish the expenses and reform their articles accordingly. The answer is too plain, and who is so blind as not to observe a parallel to this, in the Government of North Carolina? But it may be said, that some of the partners, whose substance is let out by this ruinous co-partnership, do not complain, and yet does that, in any way justify the infliction of this injury upon those who do complain of it? In the school of party, stimulated by jealousy and a love of power, logic-like, this may pass for substantial; but what is it in the school of reason and justice? Let candor and conscience answer the enquiry. SENEX.

Importance of Newspapers.—"The habits of our government," says Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to Col. Carrington, "being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

AN EXPOSITION
Of the Virginia Resolutions of 1798.
No. III.
TO THOMAS RITCHIE, ESQ.
[CONTINUED.]

I am now to prove to you, Sir, that nullification is the only mode in which the usurpations of the Federal Government may be resisted by the States, in accordance with the principles of our resolutions of 1798. During as you may consider this enterprise, I do not enter upon it with any fear, although I approach without flourish of trumpets, or any other parade. I am a plain, practical man, and desire to state my opinions in a manner which other plain, practical men will understand. If such men are not the ornaments of the country, they are at least its strength and support, and the very people to whose capacity all reasoning upon political subjects ought to be addressed.

I beg you to bear in mind the principles which have already been stated as deducible from the resolutions of 1798. Perhaps our best course of proceeding will be to state them in detail, and see whether nullification does or does not conform to every one of them.

1. The resolutions assert that there is some mode within the Constitution by which the usurpations of the Federal Government may be resisted by the States. Now, it is true that nullification is denied to be a constitutional remedy; but the nullifiers assert that it is constitutional; and I mention the point only to show that they do not intend to assert any extra-constitutional or revolutionary remedy; and that, so far, at least, they are within the resolutions of 1798. Whether their remedy is constitutional or not, supposing the principles of the resolutions to be so, must depend on its conformity with those principles in the subsequent propositions. We remark, therefore, that

2. The remedy must be such as to "arrest the progress of the evil." Now, be pleased to bear in mind, that nullification does not proceed upon any supposed right of a State to repeal a constitutional law, but upon the right of a State to declare that an unconstitutional law really is so, and to refuse obedience to it for that reason. I beg you to bear this distinction in mind. If nullification proceeds upon anything more than this, it is not the remedy intended by the resolutions.

Now, Sir, is now the right of a State to decide on the constitutionality of an act of Congress) distinctly asserted in the resolutions of 1798? Nay, has not Virginia asserted it in practice, both in regard to the alien and sedition laws, and in regard to these very tariff laws themselves? We all know that such is the fact. And was not resistance to such unconstitutional laws distinctly contemplated in the resolutions of 1798? I have already shown that it was; and if any farther proof is necessary, it will be found, in all abundance, in the address to the people which accompanied those resolutions. It appears, then, that the principles upon which nullification proceeds, are (in the abstract) in strict conformity with those of the resolutions of 1798. But those principles, it is admitted, must be limited and qualified by the object in view. We are, then, to inquire whether nullification does, or does not, "arrest the progress of the evil." The evil is the exercise of an usurped power; nullification declares that the usurped power shall no longer be obeyed. Is not this the best of all possible modes, if not the only mode, in which it can be "arrested"? Perhaps it is not too great a refinement to say, that the "arrest" here contemplated, is of the usurpation only, and not of the usurping power. In other words, it is not designed to put down the Federal Government—nor embarrass nor impede its legitimate operation; but simply to prevent it from exercising a power which does not belong to it. Hence, no resort is contemplated in the resolutions of 1798, to any measures which may subvert the existence of that Government to the decision of arms. Its operations within the Constitution must all go on as before, whilst its operations beyond the Constitution must be "arrested." Now, this is precisely and peculiarly the effect of nullification. And, strange to tell, it is on this very ground that you and others have most strongly assailed that doctrine. You all say, that it is absurd to pretend that a State can be in the Union and out of the Union at the same time; and that it is monstrous in a State to contend for all the advantages of the Union, as to certain laws, while she refuses to submit to the burthens imposed by other laws. Nothing in nature can be more perfectly self-evident than all this. It is not surprising that a man of Gen. Jackson's measure of intellect and information should be deceived by such a superficial view of the subject; but we had a right to expect better things from a veteran in politics, like your self. Remember, Sir, that a law beyond the Constitution is no law at all, and there is no right any where to enforce it. A State which refuses to submit to such a pretended law, is strictly within the Union—because she is in strict obedience to the Constitution; and it is strange to say that she "refuses to submit to the burthens" imposed by any law which is not

LAW AT ALL. There, then, you have a picture of nullification. It secures to the State the right to remain in the Union; and to enjoy all the advantages which the Constitution and laws can afford—submitting, at the same time, to all which that Constitution and laws rightfully enjoin; while it "arrests the progress" of usurped power, by destroying the obligation of every pretended law which the Constitution does not authorize, and which, therefore, is not law. It is this is not the meaning of the resolutions of 1798, I have much misunderstood them. It is precisely upon this point that the public mind of Virginia has been most strangely misled by the authority of the President's name, and the speciousness of your paragraphs. You owe the people a heavy debt of reparation, which I hope you will live to pay. This leads us to the second object of the resolutions of 1798, which is "to maintain within the limits of the respective States, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them." I have already shown, in my second letter, that these authorities, rights, and liberties, are not merely those which belong to every sovereign State, and which may be enjoyed as well in a state of separation as in league with others, but, also, all the authorities, rights, and liberties which the States are entitled to, under the Constitution, and as members of the Union. No State, therefore, can possibly effect this object of the resolutions of 1798, by any proceeding which either withdraws her from the Union, or weakens her just influence in it.

The remarks offered under the preceding head, apply with equal force and propriety to this. You and the President both say, that it is arrogance and presumption in a State to insist on retaining her place and influence in the Union, while she refuses to submit to a part of its laws. Admitting, again, that this is perfectly true, but re-asserting that it can not apply to the refusal of a State to submit to what is not law, I have to ask you how it is possible for a State to "maintain her authorities, rights, and liberties," except by the check which she may apply, as a State, and as a member of the United States, to the usurpations of the Federal Government, or by an appeal to arms? I pray you, Sir, to enlighten my understanding on this subject. If you cannot do so, I will endeavor to do it for you.

At all events, until it shall be done by some one or other, I shall be compelled to continue in my present heresy. If it was the meaning and object of the resolutions of 1798, that the States had the right, and were in duty bound, to resist the usurpations of the Federal Government, by some means which, at the same time that it arrested the evil, should preserve the Union unbroken, I should be permitted to think that nullification, if it does not attain these objects completely, comes much nearer to it than any other proceeding which has yet been proposed. I know, Sir, that you, and hundreds of others, have said that the resolutions of 1798 have been misinterpreted. Perhaps so. It is true their language has appeared to me, and to others like me, to be extremely plain—and it is our own construction of it alone which has formed our principle. Yet it is possible that it may hide some meaning deeper than we have been able to penetrate. I pray you to tell us what it is. Do not content yourself with the trinity only; but let us know the precise extent of our rights, and the precise mode in which they may be constitutionally asserted, according to the resolutions of 1798.

It has not escaped my attention, that, according to those resolutions, the State interposition which they contemplate is not authorized, except in cases of "deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted." It will be obvious, however, to intellects less clear than your own, that this does not affect, in any degree, the principle upon which State resistance is justified, nor even the mode in which it may be exerted. It merely points out the proper occasion for the application of the principle. And it will be sufficient here to remark, that, according to your own theory, which in this respect agrees with the resolutions, each State is the exclusive judge for itself, whether the usurpation is deliberate, palpable & dangerous, or not. It follows, of course, that no objection to nullification can be derived from this view of the subject.

I have now, Sir, to present to you a dilemma, connected with this part of our inquiries, and to ask you in what manner you propose to escape its horns?

South Carolina says that an unconstitutional law is void, and so say the Virginia Resolutions: South Carolina says that each State has a right to decide for itself whether a law is constitutional or not, and so say the Virginia Resolutions: South Carolina, in the exercise of this right, has declared that the tariff laws are unconstitutional, and so say the Virginia Resolutions of 1823 and 1829, (have forgotten the date,) and so, Mr. Ritchie, say you. How, then, can you countenance the President, in subjecting the citizens of South Carolina to the sword, for not submitting to what you yourself, be it to be a sheer usurpation on the part of the Federal Government!

Do, Sir, in pity to our oppressed spirits, answer this question. You will not answer it, Sir—because you CANNOT answer it, without convicting yourself of inconsistency. This I will prove—for I do not mean to allow you any refuge from this dilemma. South Carolina is either right in her proceedings, (principles and all,) or else she is wrong. If she is right, then there can be no pretence whatever for making war upon her; if she is wrong, how does that fact appear? It is admitted that the other States, co-parties with her to the Constitution, have not said so. Congress alone, and the President, or rather the Federal Government, has said it. Do you, Sir, acknowledge any such right in the Federal Government? Is it not perfectly clear, that if such right exist, the Federal Government is an appellate tribunal, with power to decide, in the last resort, upon the constitutionality of its own acts? Of what avail is the right of a State to pronounce that an unconstitutional act of Congress is really so, if Congress may overrule that decision? Is not this, Sir, the very essence of that consolidation against which the Virginia Resolutions, Madison's Report, and your own valuable labors, have so long contended? It is impossible, then, for you to justify Congress and the President, except by asserting, either that Congress may overrule the decision of South Carolina, upon a question touching their own powers, and by the same rule, may overrule the decision of every other State, and thus become the sole judges of the extent of their own powers; or by asserting that they may constitutionally enforce an unconstitutional law. Can you, Sir, escape this difficulty, without abandoning every principle for which you have professed to contend for thirty years? I am exceedingly anxious to know in what manner you will do it. For myself, I can discover but one possible loop hole of retreat, and even that I will endeavor to close upon you. I reserve this, however, for a succeeding letter.

No. IV.

In my last letter, Sir I submitted for your solution, a proposition which appears to me to place you in considerable difficulty. A lion in the toils might in perfect consistency with his character, decline all means of escape, through fear of committing himself to a course which he was not determined on pursuing it. I proceed to show you that you cannot do so, if you would.

You will perhaps say, that a State has a right to pronounce on the constitutionality of an act of Congress; yet it is, nevertheless, bound to submit to an act so pronounced to be unconstitutional, until the other States shall have sanctioned its decision. This, if it were true, might perhaps afford some ground of apology for the President and Congress. It is this which I have already alluded to, as presenting the only possible chance of escape from the horns of my dilemma. Indeed, Sir, it may be useful for you to know, that a great many of the most vociferous denouncers of nullification go with it, in perfect fellowship, until it reaches this point. I will endeavor now to show you that there is no sort of reason for separating here; and if I should succeed in this effort, you may rely upon it, that a vast number who are now in your ranks will desert to mine. I affirm, therefore, that the Resolutions of 1798, so far from countenancing the idea that a State which has pronounced an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, is bound to obey that law, until the other States shall sanction its decision, do distinctly assert the precise reverse. This, I submit, not, I shall prove.

I presume it will readily be admitted, that Madison's Report, which was made expressly to sustain those resolutions, is a fair interpreter of their meaning. That report, after stating the proposition, that "where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the judges in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated," proceeds thus:—"The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows, of necessity, that there can be no tribunal above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and, consequently, that, as the parties to it, they must decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of such a magnitude to require that interposition. From this view of the resolution, it would seem inconceivable that it can mean any just disapprobation from those who, laying aside all momentary impressions, and recollecting the genuine source and object of the Federal Constitution, shall candidly and accurately interpret the meaning of the General Assembly. If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the Constitution, could not justify the parties to it, in interposing, even so far as to avert the progress of the evil, and thereby to preserve the Constitution itself, as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end of all relief from usurped power, and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the Bibles

ment! Do, Sir, in pity to our oppressed spirits, answer this question. You will not answer it, Sir—because you CANNOT answer it, without convicting yourself of inconsistency. This I will prove—for I do not mean to allow you any refuge from this dilemma. South Carolina is either right in her proceedings, (principles and all,) or else she is wrong. If she is right, then there can be no pretence whatever for making war upon her; if she is wrong, how does that fact appear? It is admitted that the other States, co-parties with her to the Constitution, have not said so. Congress alone, and the President, or rather the Federal Government, has said it. Do you, Sir, acknowledge any such right in the Federal Government? Is it not perfectly clear, that if such right exist, the Federal Government is an appellate tribunal, with power to decide, in the last resort, upon the constitutionality of its own acts? Of what avail is the right of a State to pronounce that an unconstitutional act of Congress is really so, if Congress may overrule that decision? Is not this, Sir, the very essence of that consolidation against which the Virginia Resolutions, Madison's Report, and your own valuable labors, have so long contended? It is impossible, then, for you to justify Congress and the President, except by asserting, either that Congress may overrule the decision of South Carolina, upon a question touching their own powers, and by the same rule, may overrule the decision of every other State, and thus become the sole judges of the extent of their own powers; or by asserting that they may constitutionally enforce an unconstitutional law. Can you, Sir, escape this difficulty, without abandoning every principle for which you have professed to contend for thirty years? I am exceedingly anxious to know in what manner you will do it. For myself, I can discover but one possible loop hole of retreat, and even that I will endeavor to close upon you. I reserve this, however, for a succeeding letter.

No. IV.

In my last letter, Sir I submitted for your solution, a proposition which appears to me to place you in considerable difficulty. A lion in the toils might in perfect consistency with his character, decline all means of escape, through fear of committing himself to a course which he was not determined on pursuing it. I proceed to show you that you cannot do so, if you would.

You will perhaps say, that a State has a right to pronounce on the constitutionality of an act of Congress; yet it is, nevertheless, bound to submit to an act so pronounced to be unconstitutional, until the other States shall have sanctioned its decision. This, if it were true, might perhaps afford some ground of apology for the President and Congress. It is this which I have already alluded to, as presenting the only possible chance of escape from the horns of my dilemma. Indeed, Sir, it may be useful for you to know, that a great many of the most vociferous denouncers of nullification go with it, in perfect fellowship, until it reaches this point. I will endeavor now to show you that there is no sort of reason for separating here; and if I should succeed in this effort, you may rely upon it, that a vast number who are now in your ranks will desert to mine. I affirm, therefore, that the Resolutions of 1798, so far from countenancing the idea that a State which has pronounced an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, is bound to obey that law, until the other States shall sanction its decision, do distinctly assert the precise reverse. This, I submit, not, I shall prove.

I presume it will readily be admitted, that Madison's Report, which was made expressly to sustain those resolutions, is a fair interpreter of their meaning. That report, after stating the proposition, that "where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the judges in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated," proceeds thus:—"The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows, of necessity, that there can be no tribunal above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and, consequently, that, as the parties to it, they must decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of such a magnitude to require that interposition. From this view of the resolution, it would seem inconceivable that it can mean any just disapprobation from those who, laying aside all momentary impressions, and recollecting the genuine source and object of the Federal Constitution, shall candidly and accurately interpret the meaning of the General Assembly. If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the Constitution, could not justify the parties to it, in interposing, even so far as to avert the progress of the evil, and thereby to preserve the Constitution itself, as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end of all relief from usurped power, and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the Bibles

ment! Do, Sir, in pity to our oppressed spirits, answer this question. You will not answer it, Sir—because you CANNOT answer it, without convicting yourself of inconsistency. This I will prove—for I do not mean to allow you any refuge from this dilemma. South Carolina is either right in her proceedings, (principles and all,) or else she is wrong. If she is right, then there can be no pretence whatever for making war upon her; if she is wrong, how does that fact appear? It is admitted that the other States, co-parties with her to the Constitution, have not said so. Congress alone, and the President, or rather the Federal Government, has said it. Do you, Sir, acknowledge any such right in the Federal Government? Is it not perfectly clear, that if such right exist, the Federal Government is an appellate tribunal, with power to decide, in the last resort, upon the constitutionality of its own acts? Of what avail is the right of a State to pronounce that an unconstitutional act of Congress is really so, if Congress may overrule that decision? Is not this, Sir, the very essence of that consolidation against which the Virginia Resolutions, Madison's Report, and your own valuable labors, have so long contended? It is impossible, then, for you to justify Congress and the President, except by asserting, either that Congress may overrule the decision of South Carolina, upon a question touching their own powers, and by the same rule, may overrule the decision of every other State, and thus become the sole judges of the extent of their own powers; or by asserting that they may constitutionally enforce an unconstitutional law. Can you, Sir, escape this difficulty, without abandoning every principle for which you have professed to contend for thirty years? I am exceedingly anxious to know in what manner you will do it. For myself, I can discover but one possible loop hole of retreat, and even that I will endeavor to close upon you. I reserve this, however, for a succeeding letter.

No. IV.

In my last letter, Sir I submitted for your solution, a proposition which appears to me to place you in considerable difficulty. A lion in the toils might in perfect consistency with his character, decline all means of escape, through fear of committing himself to a course which he was not determined on pursuing it. I proceed to show you that you cannot do so, if you would.

You will perhaps say, that a State has a right to pronounce on the constitutionality of an act of Congress; yet it is, nevertheless, bound to submit to an act so pronounced to be unconstitutional, until the other States shall have sanctioned its decision. This, if it were true, might perhaps afford some ground of apology for the President and Congress. It is this which I have already alluded to, as presenting the only possible chance of escape from the horns of my dilemma. Indeed, Sir, it may be useful for you to know, that a great many of the most vociferous denouncers of nullification go with it, in perfect fellowship, until it reaches this point. I will endeavor now to show you that there is no sort of reason for separating here; and if I should succeed in this effort, you may rely upon it, that a vast number who are now in your ranks will desert to mine. I affirm, therefore, that the Resolutions of 1798, so far from countenancing the idea that a State which has pronounced an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, is bound to obey that law, until the other States shall sanction its decision, do distinctly assert the precise reverse. This, I submit, not, I shall prove.

I presume it will readily be admitted, that Madison's Report, which was made expressly to sustain those resolutions, is a fair interpreter of their meaning. That report, after stating the proposition, that "where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the judges in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated," proceeds thus:—"The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows, of necessity, that there can be no tribunal above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and, consequently, that, as the parties to it, they must decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of such a magnitude to require that interposition. From this view of the resolution, it would seem inconceivable that it can mean any just disapprobation from those who, laying aside all momentary impressions, and recollecting the genuine source and object of the Federal Constitution, shall candidly and accurately interpret the meaning of the General Assembly. If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the Constitution, could not justify the parties to it, in interposing, even so far as to avert the progress of the evil, and thereby to preserve the Constitution itself, as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end of all relief from usurped power, and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the Bibles

ment! Do, Sir, in pity to our oppressed spirits, answer this question. You will not answer it, Sir—because you CANNOT answer it, without convicting yourself of inconsistency. This I will prove—for I do not mean to allow you any refuge from this dilemma. South Carolina is either right in her proceedings, (principles and all,) or else she is wrong. If she is right, then there can be no pretence whatever for making war upon her; if she is wrong, how does that fact appear? It is admitted that the other States, co-parties with her to the Constitution, have not said so. Congress alone, and the President, or rather the Federal Government, has said it. Do you, Sir, acknowledge any such right in the Federal Government? Is it not perfectly clear, that if such right exist, the Federal Government is an appellate tribunal, with power to decide, in the last resort, upon the constitutionality of its own acts? Of what avail is the right of a State to pronounce that an unconstitutional act of Congress is really so, if Congress may overrule that decision? Is not this, Sir, the very essence of that consolidation against which the Virginia Resolutions, Madison's Report, and your own valuable labors, have so long contended? It is impossible, then, for you to justify Congress and the President, except by asserting, either that Congress may overrule the decision of South Carolina, upon a question touching their own powers, and by the same rule, may overrule the decision of every other State, and thus become the sole judges of the extent of their own powers; or by asserting that they may constitutionally enforce an unconstitutional law. Can you, Sir, escape this difficulty, without abandoning every principle for which you have professed to contend for thirty years? I am exceedingly anxious to know in what manner you will do it. For myself, I can discover but one possible loop hole of retreat, and even that I will endeavor to close upon you. I reserve this, however, for a succeeding letter.

No. IV.

In my last letter, Sir I submitted for your solution, a proposition which appears to me to place you in considerable difficulty. A lion in the toils might in perfect consistency with his character, decline all means of escape, through fear of committing himself to a course which he was not determined on pursuing it. I proceed to show you that you cannot do so, if you would.

You will perhaps say, that a State has a right to pronounce on the constitutionality of an act of Congress; yet it is, nevertheless, bound to submit to an act so pronounced to be unconstitutional, until the other States shall have sanctioned its decision. This, if it were true, might perhaps afford some ground of apology for the President and Congress. It is this which I have already alluded to, as presenting the only possible chance of escape from the horns of my dilemma. Indeed, Sir, it may be useful for you to know, that a great many of the most vociferous denouncers of nullification go with it, in perfect fellowship, until it reaches this point. I will endeavor now to show you that there is no sort of reason for separating here; and if I should succeed in this effort, you may rely upon it, that a vast number who are now in your ranks will desert to mine. I affirm, therefore, that the Resolutions of 1798, so far from countenancing the idea that a State which has pronounced an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, is bound to obey that law, until the other States shall sanction its decision, do distinctly assert the precise reverse. This, I submit, not, I shall prove.

I presume it will readily be admitted, that Madison's Report, which was made expressly to sustain those resolutions, is a fair interpreter of their meaning. That report, after stating the proposition, that "where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the judges in the last resort, whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated," proceeds thus:—"The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows, of necessity, that there can be no tribunal above their authority, to decide, in the last resort, whether the compact made by them be violated; and, consequently, that, as the parties to it, they must decide, in the last resort, such questions as may be of such a magnitude to require that interposition. From this view of the resolution, it would seem inconceivable that it can mean any just disapprobation from those who, laying aside all momentary impressions, and recollecting the genuine source and object of the Federal Constitution, shall candidly and accurately interpret the meaning of the General Assembly. If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the Constitution, could not justify the parties to it, in interposing, even so far as to avert the progress of the evil, and thereby to preserve the Constitution itself, as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end of all relief from usurped power, and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the Bibles

ment! Do, Sir, in pity to our oppressed spirits, answer this question. You will not answer it, Sir—because you CANNOT answer it, without convicting yourself of inconsistency. This I will prove—for I do not mean to allow you any refuge from this dilemma. South Carolina is either right in her proceedings, (principles and all,) or else she is wrong. If she is right, then there can be no pretence whatever for making war upon her; if she is wrong, how does that fact appear? It is admitted that the other States, co-parties with her to the Constitution, have not said so. Congress alone, and the President, or rather the Federal Government, has said it. Do you, Sir, acknowledge any such right in the Federal Government? Is it not perfectly clear, that if such right exist, the Federal Government is an appellate tribunal, with power to decide, in the last resort, upon the constitutionality of its own acts? Of what avail is the right of a State to pronounce that an unconstitutional act of Congress is really so, if Congress may overrule that decision? Is not this, Sir, the very essence of that consolidation against which the Virginia Resolutions, Madison's Report, and your own valuable labors, have so long contended? It is impossible, then, for you to justify Congress and the President, except by asserting, either that Congress may overrule the decision of South Carolina, upon a question touching their own powers, and by the same rule, may overrule the decision of every other State, and thus become the sole judges of the extent of their own powers; or by asserting that they may constitutionally enforce an unconstitutional law. Can you, Sir, escape this difficulty, without abandoning every principle for which you have professed to contend for thirty years? I am exceedingly anxious to know in what manner you will do it. For myself, I can discover but one possible loop hole of retreat, and even that I will endeavor to close upon you. I reserve this, however, for a succeeding letter.

No. IV.

In my last letter, Sir I submitted for your solution, a proposition which appears to me to place you in considerable difficulty. A lion in the toils might in perfect consistency with his character, decline all means of escape, through fear of committing himself to a course which he was not determined on pursuing it. I proceed to show you that you cannot do so, if you would.

You will perhaps say, that a State has a right to pronounce on the constitutionality of an act of Congress; yet it is, nevertheless, bound to submit to an act so pronounced to be unconstitutional, until the other States shall have sanctioned its decision. This, if it were true, might perhaps afford some ground of apology for the President and Congress. It is this which I have already alluded to, as presenting the only possible chance of escape from the horns of my dilemma. Indeed, Sir, it may be useful for you to know, that a great many of the most vociferous denouncers of nullification go with it, in perfect fellowship, until it reaches this point. I will endeavor now to show you that there is no sort of reason for

Co. situations, as well as a plain denial of a fundamental principle on which our independence itself is based.

This language appears to be plain enough for any common understanding. It means a law that beyond the limitation of S. C. 1868. Then it admits that the other States, acting as such, may override her decision; but the resolutions, as explained by the report, constitute each decision as to the law, report, and therefore, final and conclusive. This must be the correct interpretation, unless the report, by the term "States," and "parties," intended to limit itself to the plural number, and of course, not to include a single State, acting by itself. This is, at least, a more plausible, altogether unworthy of the dignity of the subject, but as there appears to be a determination to get rid of our old constitution in some way, or other, their friends must not neglect their defense even at these points which would seem to be improperly intruded. If, then, the resolutions do not contemplate the interposition of each State for itself, they must contemplate each interposition either by all the States, or by a majority of the States, or by a plural number, less than a majority of the States. If the first was meant, it was a most useless and ridiculous parade of argument, to prove what is altogether self-evident. Certainly those who made the Government have a right not only to elect, and control it, but even to unmake it, whenever all of them concur in that wish. If, therefore, this be the meaning of the resolutions, they only affirm what no one would ever think of denying, and what is equally true of other Governments as ours. Do the resolutions, then, refer to a majority of the States? The same remark applies here. The right of a majority to rule, is a fundamental principle in all Representative Governments, supposing always, that they exercise that right consistently with the rights of the minority. It follows, a fortiori, that they have a right to interpose to prevent the minority from usurping upon their rights. If, then, this be the meaning of the resolutions, they employ a very needless solemnity in affirming a mere truism. Besides, it is idle to suppose, that the interposition either of all the States, or of a majority of them, is intended to be as a check, as a right, when the object is to correct the usurpations of that very majority itself. Certainly those who do the wrong, do not only have a right to redress it, but are in every bound to do so. Do the resolutions, then, contemplate a plural number less than a majority? If so, a single State may act for itself, upon the same principle; for there is no rule, either in ethics or politics, which measures the rights of a majority, by the mere number who may happen to compose it. Indeed, that action by a single State, for itself, was contemplated, is manifest enough, from other considerations. In the first place, the language imports it, and will be so understood by every reader, who is not prone to look for reflection and subtlety in every thing. Moreover, it is the particular object of the written Constitution to define and limit the powers of the Government; to guard against usurpations; to protect the weak against the strong; to guard the rights of the minority against the encroachments of the majority. The States, when they formed the compact, brought to that work their entire sovereignty, and all their rights. If they did not then surrender that sovereignty and those rights altogether, or they must have designed to reserve to themselves the task of protecting them. A case may very well arise, in which an unconstitutional law may affect the rights of a single State only; and it would be a mockery of the very name of State rights, to say that, in such case, she may not protect herself. In what other course can her "safety" be "provided" for? If twenty three States should unite in cutting up every right which appertains to the twenty-fourth, that State no redress except what a "majority" of her oppressors may choose to grant? If this be the meaning of the resolutions, so far from affirming and protecting State rights, they affirm that no single State has any rights at all. Besides, the resolutions speak only of the reserved rights of the States; among which reserved rights, is that which authorizes State interposition, to arrest the usurpations of the Federal Government. Now, how are these rights "reserved"? Do one State "reserve" its own rights to another State, or any number of other States? This seems to me to be a grant and not a reservation of a right. Each State, then, reserves its own rights to itself, and the resolutions affirm that the right to refuse obedience to an unconstitutional law, is among those reserved rights. Again: If the State may act upon its own decision, until the majority have sanctioned it, the right to decide, is as to all practical results, left to the majority, and not to the State. The State has only the right to express its opinion which opinion, although involving her "safety," and her very existence, is for nothing, until approved by others. This is, indeed, a measure State right, Mr. Ritchie. Besides, Sir, there is not some contradiction in the position that a State may declare a law to be unconstitutional, and yet that it is bound to submit to that law, for some given time? What difference is there, in principle, between an obligation to submit to an unconstitutional law for one day, or for one year, or for ever? I confess that I can see none at all. Finally, Sir, for the subject can really not waste of even those few precious and popular views of the subject that the other States should refuse to say whether the particular State which undertakes to pronounce a law unconstitutional, is right or wrong? There are no means of compelling them to decide, and, therefore, a majority of the States, upon your suggestion, (if it be yours,) have only to stand mute in order to deprive all the other States of constitutionally too, of every right which appertains to them. Day

After the other States should be disposed of upon the subject in good faith, the right which the individual State lawfully possesses, may be such as to be last forever, unless it be promptly asserted. Our own resolution will at once suggest to you such a case. The very delay, therefore, of this previous appeal, may be fatal to the very existence of the right. I can hardly think that it was the intention of the resolutions of 1798, to produce any such result as this.

And now, Sir, let me bring you back to my dilemma. The resolutions of 1798, approved by you, acknowledge the right of South Carolina to pronounce the tariff laws unconstitutional, and do not require that she shall forbear to act on that decision, until it shall be affirmed by a majority of the other States. South Carolina has pronounced those laws unconstitutional; and you have over and over again declared, that she is right in that respect. How can you countenance the President and Congress, in subjecting her people to the sword, for not obeying those laws? I would, if a regard to decorum did not forbid it, defy you to the answer. You ought to give it, and plainly, and satisfactorily too, or else you ought to change your course. You are encouraging the President in making war upon South Carolina. It is war, Sir, however you may disguise it—civil war—with all its unnumbered train of sufferings, tears and sorrows. A husband and a father who contemplates this result, must have a nature more callous than I take yours to be, if he can admit into his calculations, either the "feelings" of a political favorite, the success of party objects, or the poor pride of opinion. You can, if you choose, arrest the wide spreading desolation with which our whole country is threatened. I beseech you to reflect that it is at least possible, you are permitting innocent blood to be shed, when it is in your power to prevent it. Shall it not, hereafter, be required at your hands?

I know, Sir, that you have too much respect for public opinion and for decency, to urge on the mad measures of this administration, without, at least, an attempt to justify your course. I read your paper constantly, yet seldom, of late, without mortification and sorrow. I have seen upon what grounds it is, that you are willing to consign to the sword—a sword that was never known to spare—a people of as generous and lofty a character as the whole world can show. The President has profited by your suggestions, and has founded his proposed measures of violence and carnage, upon reasons with which you have furnished him. The history of that man's past life, affords full and terrible proof, that he never wants excuses, good or bad, for any outrage which he may propose to perpetrate upon the laws and Constitution of his country. Posterity will do him justice although this age seems determined to be blind to his real character. I cannot close these letters without an attempt to show, that there is no reason whatever which can justify or extenuate the arbitrary purpose which he now undertakes. I have not yet, however, quite done with the subject of nullification. It will be continued in my next letter.

From the Elgfield Carolinian.

On the 20th ult. a "State Rights Festival" was held in Monroe County, Georgia, in honor of Judge BRUNNEN. From the Macon Messenger we learn, that the assemblage was highly imposing for character and numbers, and the preparations, though ample and abundant, fell far short of affording accommodation to the multitude that thronged upon the occasion.

Judging from the Toasts and Addresses, the finest spirits must have animated the meeting. The extemporaneous Speech of M. B. LAMAR is replete with the fire and energy of indignant patriotism. The following extract is a specimen of the force and eloquence which pervades the address throughout:

"My fellow citizens, link not with these the foes of your State. They say that the unrighteous exactions of the Tariff—the tribute money they demand—shall be paid, if not peaceably, it shall be wrested by the force of arms. Who will aid them in the unholy cause?—Is there one in this assembly—is there an apostate in the whole State of Georgia, among her native or adopted sons, who would armed and equipped fall in the ranks of an invading army against the land he makes his home; and for the unhallowed purpose of extorting from his own brethren, that which he knows and admits, is unjustly demanded? If there be in the sound of my voice such a degraded partisan, let him speak, that he may by the avowal of his unbecoming treachery, gibbet himself an object of abhorrence, and execration to the present generation, and if deemed to live in history, to survive there, only to stink in the nostrils of posterity. He who knows not that his country is wronged, may reluctantly go to her defense; he who is sensible of the wrongs, yet fears to write them, is despicable enough; but what terms of denunciation are strong enough for him who glories in the injury inflicted and is base enough to perpetrate it by fire and sword. His blood is unworthy to stain the blade of a freeman—let him die the death of a dog."

We have not had leisure to read General BEALL'S Speech. He closed with the following sentiment:

John Caldwell Calhoun... The triumph and vindicator of State Rights.

The shouts of approbation, says the Messenger, with which the announcement of the above sentiment was received, proves beyond all doubt, that the people of Georgia generally, like the speaker, have given up all pretensions for or against particular individuals, and are determined to be guided alone by principles in their choice between men.

From the Newbern Spectator.

TO THE FREE MEN OF CRAVEN COUNTY.

A subject of deep interest to you and to the State of North Carolina is now presented to the people, and I hope I may be pardoned for putting before you some of the peculiar claims it has upon the people of Craven. We have been long accustomed to regard the question of a change in our Constitution with feelings of distrust and abhorrence, but it has been so without just cause. It addresses itself now to our republican professions, to our sense of justice and to our immediate interest, and all these considerations unite in demanding our support of a Reform. You are referred to the address of a Committee appointed to lay the whole subject before the people, and you will not neglect to peruse that exposition and listen to that appeal. The friends of a Reform desire to change the Constitution in three respects,—1st, To make our Representation in the Assembly more equal; 2dly, To make our Assemblies more numerous and less frequent; 3dly, To have the Governor to be elected by the people. There are other minor proposals for change, but these are the only points about which much difference of opinion prevails. And why shall the People of Craven refuse to vote for a change in these respects? There are good reasons why you should not refuse it.

1. By our present Constitution one third of the people elect a majority of your law-givers, who impose taxes, and expend them for the other two thirds. Is this republican? Is this just? Out of the 64 counties in the State there are more than 40 which do not pay taxes equal to their own expenses as a part of the government! Is this wise? They spend 15,000 dollars a year more than they pay! Is this fair and right? They elect two-thirds of our Assembly! Twenty-one counties of the State elect a minority of the Assembly while they are a majority of the people, pay all their own expenses and are made to contribute an overplus to meet the one-fourth deficit in the other 43 counties.—Craven County is among these 21 tax-paying counties. Craven County has a white population of 7,200, and pays to the State an annual tax of \$1800! This population is nearly twice that of any one county among 19 in the State; these taxes are more than double the amount of those paid by any one county among 22 in the State, and yet the people of Craven elect only the same number of members to the Assembly as any other county. These taxes are equal to the aggregate amount of those paid by 8 other counties, but while Craven elects only 3 they send 15 members to the Assembly! These taxes are equal to 6 times the taxes of some other counties whose population is not one half of Craven's! Craven County elects 3 among 199 members to the Assembly; and the proposed change contemplates that it shall choose 3 among 137 members, so that Craven elects one-sixth of our General Assembly and is now over-represented in the Assembly by electing one-fifth of the whole. Is it for the interest of the people of Craven to reject this offer by refusing to vote for the Reform? If the People reverence the old republican principles of our free government (as I am satisfied they did in olden times) they will vote to make a change in our basis of Representation.

If they are just to themselves and to a majority of the State, they will vote for such a change, if they are not blind to their own interest, they will vote for such a change. Fellow-Citizens, are you to follow the maxims of that school of new-fangled republicanism which denies that a majority of the people of a State must govern in State matters? I shall be better able to answer my own question after next August. Do not be deceived into the belief that Craven has been always opposed to a change in our representation. In 1788 it was proposed to change the constitution, and for the reasons that are now assigned, and Craven County voted in favor of the proposition! Justice, Republicanism, consistency with first principles, and your own interest require you to instruct your Representatives to follow this example of your fathers. I know that the Candidates for our Legislature would readily acquiesce in any determination that is made by the people, and follow your instructions. I say "I know it" because I have confidence in the political principles of those whom you will elect.

2. But besides this unequal, oppressive and unjust system of representation, we hear complaints that the Legislature is too numerous, and is too often, and it is proposed to the People to answer whether it would not be better to have our General Assemblies biennial instead of their being annual, and you ought to answer, "Aye!"—1. A numerous Legislature costs too much, and Craven County is among those 21 tax-paying counties before named. It causes the Sessions to be too long, and this again adds to the expenses of the State, while it will soon become indispensable to diminish our government expenses or increase the taxes, for the former do now exceed the latter from 13,000 to 17,000 dollars.—2. The annual sessions of our Assembly do again add to our expenses more than 40,000 dollars a year;—but if they met only once in two years, half of this sum would be saved. Annual assemblies bring other evils on the people; they cause the laws to be changed too often, and so many of them are passed that a plain man can't keep with them. When the Legislature cost 15,000 or 20,000 dollars a year, viz: about 1798, the republicans of Craven thought retrenchment necessary; and therefore voted for a reform of the Constitution to effect it, and if they had then succeeded, 10 millions of dollars would have been saved to the State, but now that those expenses are 40,000, will their sons universally persevere in voting against this example of their fathers? When the expenses of the whole government were not exceeding 40,000 dollars, the old patriots of a supply on hand for the use of travellers.

Craven voted for a reform of the Constitution, that they might be decreased, but now when our expenses are 80,000 dollars a year, will their sons refuse to profit by their own experience and their fathers' example? When the ordinary revenue of the State exceeded the necessary expenses of the government the representatives of the people of Craven voted to change the basis of elections and to alter our annual into biennial Sessions of the Legislature for economizing the public expense—and now while these expenses of the government are greater than the permanent revenue of the States, will the people of Craven prefer to pay more taxes rather than accept their full share of the power which belongs to them? Prudence, justice and interest all forbid it. Let us then awake to the consideration of this subject and do right.

III. By the present Constitution the Governor is elected by the Legislature, & it is one of the questions propounded to us whether he ought not to be chosen by the PEOPLE. How do the Republicans of Craven mean to answer? The Governor is not the chief officer of the Legislature, but of the people—and therefore the people ought to have the right to elect him. Are the people of North Carolina, unfit to be trusted with the choice of their Chief Executive Officer? Are the free-men of Craven prepared to admit this? You are clothed with the high privilege of electing the President of the United States, and is there a man among you who would consent to give that right to others? But if you are fit to choose that officer, what is there that disqualifies you to judge of the capacity of a candidate for Governor of No. Car.

But it will be said that all changes are dangerous. Here I demand to have some distinct allegations of what these dangers are. When you talk of the dangers of Revolution, I can understand it, but the reforming of a Constitution of one of the American States, upon the well established principles of popular right, is neither dangerous nor difficult. You may be deceived by the old worn out cry of "East," and "West"—but I have shown to you that the proposed change is to the interest of Craven and all the other tax-paying counties. And are not the people of the "West" North Carolinians, are they not our brethren? Will you deny rights to your brethren because they live in the "West," and yet call yourselves just and generous republicans? Will you pay more taxes and give up your own just share in the government, in order to deprive other of your fellow-citizens of that to which they are entitled? Forbid it justice! Party spirit has had its way long enough; it has checked the advancement of the State, marred the peace of her councils, interfered with the growth of her population, and prevented the development of her resources, and must soon end in presenting the alternative of higher taxes or bankruptcy. Let not the people of Craven wait with indolence for this alternative, nor longer bear the public evils without one effort to trace out and remove their cause. What have the people of Craven to fear from the "West"? Will they tax you unfairly by repealing the white poll tax and increasing that on the black polls, as some pretend to fear? This they will never do, for in 10 years there will be more negroes in the West than in the East, and the proposed changes give a majority to those counties which have the largest number of slaves, as well as the largest number of whites, and to quiet all such fears they have offered to make it a part of the Constitution of the State, that the white and black poll tax shall always be the same. No! there is no danger from this majority in the West. It is proved by their readiness to give each county one Commoner, no matter how small, and to claim no more than two for any of their counties, no matter how large. They want but equal rights as is shown by their offers to compromise this dispute, and cure the evils of State. Thus, Lincoln, whose white population is 17,600, and her taxes 20,500, offers to accept the same representation with Craven whose population is 7,200, and whose taxes are 1,900 dollars. Rowan with 14,400 for a white population and 1,800 dollars taxes. Orange with 10,000, for a white population and 2,300 dollars taxes, offer the same thing.

Republicans of Craven! are you afraid to trust yourselves—are you prepared to renounce the doctrines of the Revolution and the principles that are sealed in our Declaration of Independence? If you are not, then obey these principles and yield justice and do equal right to the majority of the people. The obstinacy of party may postpone all plans of fair compromise, but success to the cause of equal representation is as sure as the institutions of the United States are permanent. Let not silence characterize your course; the friends of a peaceful reform of the Constitution have called for the expression of your judgment and opinion on the question of changing the Constitution, it is decorous that you should express them, and indeed it is due to those who shall represent you in the next Assembly, in order that they may not leave Craven County unrepresented—I repeat that they ought to be instructed to "DO JUSTICE."

"ONE OF THE PEOPLE."

To prevent the annoyance of Flies.

Farmers might easily save the flesh of horses and cows, and confer a great kindness on their animals, in preventing the usual annoyance of flies, by simply oiling the parts most exposed. Flies will not alight a moment on the spot over which an oiled sponge has been pressed. Probably either fish or flaxseed oil would answer, but what I have known used with success was the Tanner's oil. Every man who is compassionate to his beast, ought to use this simple remedy, and every lively stable, and every country Inn, ought to have a supply on hand for the use of travellers.

FROM THE VIRGINIA TIMES.

ROYAL PRIVILEGE.

Due to what Jackson's Republicanism is leading us! Due to what Van Buren's corrupt system is leading us! See to what Mr. Ritchie's '98 doctrines are leading us! Is this the first step towards the Body Guard? Is not this proposition worse than a Seditious Law? It smells of Van Buren's Republicanism and Ritchie's State Rights. We copy the article from the Charleston Mercury:

"The assault of the United States.—The New England Galaxy seems not to agree with those Government editors, who consider the Alexandria affair as a 'crime against the United States.' It thinks that new legislation is required to meet these extraordinary cases in future, and suggests the following draft of a law to our legislators:

"Be it enacted, that if any person shall offer or menace with personal violence, the President or Vice President of the United States, or any member of the cabinet, or any Senator or Representatives from any of the several States, the person so offending shall forfeit all his goods to the use of the State, shall be whipped forty stripes on the bare back, shall stand on some public pillory for three successive months, shall be confined at hard labor, in some one of the public prisons, for a term not exceeding ten nor less than two years, and shall ever after be incapable of holding any office of trust, honor, or profit under the General, or any of the State Governments."

LETTER FROM MAJOR DOWNING.

From the Portland Courier.

To Uncle Joshua Downing, Post Master, in Downingville, in the State of Maine. This to be sent by my old friend, the editor of the Portland Courier, with care and speed.

Philadelphia, June 10, 1833.

Dear Uncle Joshua,

We are coming on full chest. I've been trying ever since we started to get a chance to write a little to you; but when we've been on the road, I could not catch my breath hardly long enough to write my name, we kept flying so fast; and when we made any stop there was such a jam around us, there wasn't elbow room enough for a musketeer to turn round with out knocking his wings off.

I'm almost afraid now we shall get to Downingville before this letter does, so that we shall be likely to catch you all in the sudb before you think of it. But I understand there is a fast mail goes on that way, and I mean to send it by that, so I'm in hopes you'll get it time enough to have the children's faces washed and heads combed, and the girls get on their clean gowns. And if Sargeant Joel could have time enough to call out my old Downingsville Company and get their uniforms brushed up a little, and come down the road as far as your new barn to meet us, there's nothing would please the President better. As for victuals, most any thing would come amiss; we are hungry as bears after traveling a hundred miles a day. A little fried pork and eggs, or a pot of baked beans and an Indian pudding would suit us much better than the soft stuff they give us here in these great cities.

The President wouldn't miss seeing you for any thing in the world, and he will go down to Downingville if he has legs and arms enough left him when he gets to Portland to carry him there. But for fear any thing should happen that he shouldn't be able to come, you had better meet us in Portland, say about the 23d, and then you can go up to Downingville with us, you know.

This travelling with the President, is capital fun, after all, if it wasn't so plaguy tiresome. We come into Baltimore on a Rail-road, and we flow over the ground like a herry-cane. There isn't a horse in this country that could keep up with us, if he should go upon the clean clip. When we got to Baltimore the streets were filled with folks as thick as the spruce trees down in your swamp.—There we found Black Hawk, a little, '11, dried up Indian king. And I thought the folks looked at him and the Prophet about as much as they did at me and the President.—I give the President a wink that this Indian fellow was taking the shine off as a little, so we concluded we wouldn't have him in our company any more, and shall go on without him.

I can't stop to tell you in this letter how we got along to Philadelphia, though we had a pretty easy time some of the way in the steam boats. And I can't stop to tell you of half the fine things I have seen here. They took us up in a great hall this morning as big as a meeting house, and then the folks began to pour in by thousands to shake hands with the President; federalists and all, it made no difference. There was such a stream of 'em coming in that the hall was full in a few minutes, and it was so jammed up round that they couldn't get out again if they were to die. So they had to knock out some of the windows, and get out 'tother way.

The President shook hands with all his might an hour or two, till he got so tired he couldn't hardly stand it. I took hold and shook for him once in a while to help him along, but at last he got so tired he had to lay down on a soft bench covered with cloth and shake as well as he could, and when he couldn't he'd nod to 'em as they came along. And at last he got to bent out, he couldn't only wrinkle his forehead and wink. They then concluded it best to adjourn for to-day.

And I've made out to get away into the garret in the tavern long enough to write this letter. We shall be in New York or next day for New York, and I can possibly get breathing enough to tell you what I saw.

Give my love to all the folks in Downingville and believe me your loving nephew,

MAJOR JACK DOWNING.

From the Raleigh Register.

Our University.—Another overflowing that a new spirit is awakening in favor of the University, and that the Addressess generally delivered, by the distinguished gentlemen who accept the appointments and invitations of the Literary Societies and of the Institute of Education, have an attraction which it was not foreseen would attach to them. The houses of the village were thronged and crowded until they would hold no more. Sleeping was pretty much out of the question; they regarding themselves as fortunate who could secure a supply of the other necessities of life. The company was, however, to have borne the narrowness of their accommodations with much patience and good humor. Among the visitors, were Gov. Schenck, and Ex-Governors Owen, Iredell & Branch.

We learn, through the kindness of a friend, that on Wednesday, George A. Johnson, Esq. led the way in the exercises of the occasion, in an Address before the two Literary Societies. To such as are familiar with the intellectual efforts of that gentleman, with the unnecessary to say that his address was characterized by accurate and profound thought, strength and vigor of expression, terseness and there, with a certain sarcasm forcibly applied.

Joseph A. Hill, Esq. of Wake followed in the annual Address to the Institute, pervaded in every part by good sense, rendered the more acceptable by the wit, fancy and facility and elegance of language which accompanied and embellished it. He described with much effect his own sufferings, when an unhappy boy, he was some years ago a member of the Preparatory School at Chapel-Hill, and whilst he pleaded for a more sparing use of the rod on the part of the pedagogues, refuted his doctrines by his example—proving by the copiousness of his classical allusions, and the number of the appropriate quotations, that no one of the scourges to which he alluded had been bestowed in vain.

A Lecture on Lycæum, by James B. Johnson, Esq. gave evidence of extensive reading and research in relation to this subject, and presented an ample array of well selected facts, to which the inhabitants of the many small villages that are scattered over the surface of North Carolina would do well to give especial heed. The exercises of the day were closed by Walker Anderson, Esq. who stated the results of his own experience in the education of Females, and laid down certain just principles respecting the difference that obtains between the two sexes, in regard to the propriety of applying to them the stimulus of emulation as an incentive to exertion.

The Scheme of the Exercises on the day of Commencement is subjoined: FORENOON.

1. Prayer by the President.
2. Latin Salutary Oration. John G. Bynum, States.
3. Oration on Mental Philosophy. Dr. James B. King, Iredell.
4. A Forensic Debate. Are the political changes now in progress in the Kingdoms of Europe, likely to increase the happiness of the human race? T. Warren Kennerly Washington, H. M. Lu, Newbern.
5. Oration delivered to National Prudence. Add. E. Thom. Guilford.
6. A Forensic Debate. Will the projected emancipation of the slaves of the West Indies be attended with happy results? Edmund W. Jones, Wilkes, Josiah Stallings, Duplin.

AFTERNOON.

7. Oration on Bellox Letters. Solomon Lea, Leasburg.
8. Oration on Influence of Government on National Character and Literature. Julian E. Sawyer, Norfolk.
9. A Forensic Debate. Is it expedient that the University of North-Carolina should be removed to the immediate vicinity of Raleigh? William M. Crenshaw, Wake, Protheus E. A. Jones, Grassville.
11. Valedictory Address. W. M. Mebane, Guilford.
12. President's Address to the Graduates.
13. Degrees conferred.
14. Reading of the Report of the Examination.
15. Conclusion with prayer.

In the discussion of the question respecting the removal of the University, a particular interest was exhibited. Mr. Crenshaw applied the lash to Orange County, for the stand she has taken in regard to the Institution, with no little severity, and assured the audience that if it should be removed to Wake, the citizens of our county would be thankful for, foster and cherish it; and that the man who should think to get a seat in the Legislature by running about and telling the people he would have a law passed compelling the Students to work upon the road, would be generally despised and not get a dozen votes. To which, Mr. Jones, of Granville, replied with much animation and ingenuity. The question of removal, was also discussed in the negative, on the grounds of inexpediency. Notice was however given, that it would again be brought before the Board, at their annual meeting, in this City, next December.

Resolutions were adopted by the Trustees for completing the New Chapel that has remained so long in an unfinished state, and for filling the two vacant Professorships of Rhetoric and Modern Languages.

The degree of A. B. was conferred upon the Rev. William M. Green, of Hillsboro', Rev. Philip B. Willie, of Elizabeth City, Benjamin F. Terry, of Pittsboro', Va. James Norwood & Henry Yarrington, of Hillsboro', and James W. Armstrong, of Edenton, Georgia.

The degree of D. D. was conferred upon the Rev. John Avery, of Edenton, that of L. L. D. upon the Rev. William Hooper, of Chapel-Hill.

THE SABBATH IN PARIS.

[From the Journal of an American.]

January 24.—This day I shall long remember as the first that I ever passed in a city where the Sabbath is habitually observed as a day of cessation from labor. The religious and moral instruction, to which we are accustomed in the order and quiet of the American Sabbath, and who has reflected on the moral beauties connected with such a mode of observing the day as almost universal in our country, the contrast is striking and mournful. From his own home he expects to find some apparent difference in the aspect of the city, from that of the week day. But he is mistaken. Instead of the stillness of the Sabbath morning, he is awakened by the usual and discordant cries of the hawkers under the windows, and his first waking thought is that he has mistaken the day of the week. Later in the morning, he is not undeceived, no church going bell summons him to the house of prayer; and commerce, with its thousand noises, is as busy as on other times. As the day advances, he perceives more and more the difference between the Sabbath and the week day. The streets are thronged with the crowd, the music, the shouting of military bands, passing to be crowned by the King. Every thing that he sees is in strange discordance with the quietude of his native land, and to a religious mind such scenes are painful in the highest degree.

We walked out in search of the church of the Oratoire, in the rue St. Honoré, where, we were told, we should hear Protestant services. Here we found a mixed congregation of Americans and English, amounting to some eighty or one hundred. The Rev. Mr. Wilkes, long known by his Christian community for his indefatigable and benevolent exertions, was the preacher. I could not help feeling the difference between the apparently clandestine manner which Christians seem compelled to adopt in their meetings for worship in this great capital, and the open and fearless manner in which Christians of all denominations in our country assemble in their respective churches. In Paris religion seems to be proscribed, she is despised, and like an outcast, lurks in byways and secret chambers, while with us she walks abroad honoured, spreading cheerfulness and blessings in all her steps. Never was I so impressed with the importance of religion in promoting political and intellectual improvement, as when reflecting on the enervating distinction we enjoy in our Sabbath. How directly does the Sabbath instruction bear upon the political well-being of a country! Were it only for the reverence which is given to the intellectual faculties, in the attention bestowed upon the instructions of the pulpit, the Sabbath would well deserve the affection and protection of a free people. Our form of government could not for a moment exist, were it not for a high degree of intellectual and moral cultivation in the mass of the people, who are directly or indirectly combined in the noble mode of conducting our affairs.

Why is it that the French are incapable of sustaining free institutions? Why is it that their struggles for freedom have been stained with excesses of the most atrocious and bloody character? Because they have no Sabbath—a pulpit instruction—no religion. A people accustomed every seventh day to follow the reasonings of an ably constructed discourse cannot be deceived by the shallow and sophistical reasonings of any more political demagogues. Brute force will not be the resort of such a people in the decision of political questions. The calmness of attention, the quietness and sobriety of demeanor, (aside from the more weighty considerations of spiritual effects upon the heart,) which a Sabbath day's duties make habitual, fit men in an eminent degree for the proper orderly investigation of the less important questions of political and merely temporal concerns. Religious principles lie at the foundation of all good government.

I cannot escape from the conclusion that the political distinction among the nations, but for its foundation a well-observed Sabbath day. France is without a Sabbath, and how can her people acquire habits of sober investigation, or acuteness of mind to discover truth from sophistry? How can they learn to subdue passion and imagination, and to acquiesce in that which enlightened judgment approves? Perhaps it may be acquired at the theatre, for the theatres are churches in Paris, and on the Sabbath day and evening are thronged more than at other times. History speaks decisively as to the effects of the theatre. The history of tyranny in some ages is almost a history of actors acting well their parts, and of a people deluded by theatrical trick and scenic effect, and theatre being France shows, in her annals of no remote date, the fatal effects of her passion for the stage, when she surrounded her reason and her liberties, to him who could tread upon her neck like a hero, and dictate his commands in laconic or dramatic phraseology.

N. Y. Observer.

Italian Opera.—We translate from the Courier des Etats Unis of yesterday the following extract of a letter from Paris of 14th May, addressed to M. Borgognoni: "Our excellent friend Rivafiori arrived at a fortunate moment in Paris. The handsome M. le Bordogai was about going to Milan, where she was offered an advantageous engagement. She is now engaged for New York, and will sail towards the end of August. Other engagements are also in train. This morning he was almost enough to fall in with a firm tender, and a fine looking man, with a strong voice. You can hardly conceive how much he has succeeded in overcoming the objections which artists of the first rank have to go to the United States."

From the New York Enquirer. FOUR DAYS LATER FROM ENGLAND.

Our news schooner Eclipse arrived in town this morning, with London papers to the evening of the 23d May, brought by the packet ship Philadelphia, Captain Champlin.

The question of the expediency of the British Corn Laws had been again discussed in the House of Commons, and although it resulted in retaining all their objectionable features for the present, it is evident, we think, that some alteration in them will eventually be made. The London Courier says on this subject—

"It would appear from the observations of Lord Althorp in the House of Commons last night, that Ministers are not agreed either as to the expediency of maintaining the protective corn duties to their present extent, or as to the mode of imposing duties on the importation of foreign corn. Earl Ripon, in the House of Lords on Tuesday, distinctly declared his opinion in favor of a protective corn duty; and his declaration has been generally received throughout the country as an intimation of the intention of the cabinet not to deprive the agricultural interest of the protection which the present system affords them. Lord Althorp last night expressed his doubts whether the present system of corn laws did afford any great advantage to the landed interest. From the general tenor of his Lordship's observations, it is impossible not to come to the conclusion that Lord Althorp is inclined to a sort of free trade in corn, and the principal reason of his opposition to an inquiry into the operation of the present system of corn laws, is, as his Lordship stated, the 'unfitness of the time for such an inquiry.'"

The cotton duties reduction bill had passed both Houses and received the royal assent. It will be seen from our report of the London market, that serious apprehensions are entertained of a great scarcity of food in the British East Indies, and that it has already effected the prices of rice. A letter from Bombay, 23th November, says: "We have had so little rain this year, especially in the Deccan, that grain and forage have risen in price greatly, so much so, that in Poona and other places, the native troops have plundered several of the principal grain dealers. These disturbances have considerable trouble. The natives (the poorer classes) wish Government to fix a rate for grain, which probably will be done. A common laborer's pay in the Deccan is from three to four rupees a month—a Sepoy is seven. Grain is now selling at 34 rupees a standard, equal to about 28 lbs. English."

On the order of the day being read in the House of Commons for going into committee on the Irish Church Temporalities bill, Mr. Gillon moved as an amendment "that it be an instruction to the committee that the revenue of the church in Ireland be applied to purposes of general utility after the demise of the present incumbents." He contended that the church establishments in Ireland was unjust in principle, and indefensible as a matter of expediency. The amendment was seconded by Mr. Rippon, who characterized the present measure as a wily attempt at reform, whilst his real object was to perpetrate the grievance of compelling the majority of the people to pay for the support of a church to which they did not belong. Lord Althorp defended the principle of the bill, which would remove an admitted grievance without invading invested rights. On the division, the votes for going into committee were 128; for the amendment, 16. Majority for Ministers, 110.

On the subject of negro emancipation, a question being put in the House of Commons, to ministers, Lord Althorp said that he was glad of an opportunity to state, that ministers were determined to persevere with the question with all possible despatch. The accounts from Ireland represent the state of the public mind of that country as perfectly tranquil. The most important intelligence on foreign affairs is that relative to the Dutch and Belgian question. It would appear that the King of Holland has, at last, agreed to an indefinite armistice. An official announcement of this event has, it is true, not yet appeared, still the positive tone in which the London papers speak of it, leave little reason to doubt that it has actually taken place. There is nothing that throws any additional light on the state of affairs between Turkey and Egypt. On Portuguese affairs the London Courier says: "We are inclined to think with great caution of the contest now going on in Portugal between the army of the Queen of Portugal and the army of Don Miguel; and we should hesitate to spread reports which might either create unnecessary alarm, or inspire delusive confidence in respect to the success of the expedition of the Duke of Braganza."

Fatal Duel.—We find the following in a New Orleans paper of the 19th of June. No names are given, and the desperate affair seems to have created no ordinary impression. Such matters indeed, are regarded there with all the indifference of every day occurrences:

A duel was fought yesterday on the other side of the river, by two gentlemen of this city. The weapons were muskets, discharging forty paces. Four shots were exchanged without effect. On the fifth shot, the man on the right received a ball in the abdomen, which came out at the spine of the back, and expired this morning; the other man received a ball through one of his legs, near the ankle, which struck and broke in pieces the ankle bone of the other leg, and an amputation is thought to be unavoidable.

Robert J. Tull.—In the great contest of Liberty which has recently agitated this country, but few men took a more conspicuous part than Robert J. Tull, of South Carolina. In many essays, and public speeches, he exposed with the hand of a master, and the spirit of a patriot, the daring usurpation of the Federal Government, and warned the people of the danger impending over them. During the whole contest, he stood forth, a heat within himself, as the champion of Freedom, and to but few, is the country more indebted for the preservation of the Constitution, than to him. This Patriot is no more. He died at his residence a few weeks ago, greatly regretted by the friends of civil liberty throughout the Union—but his good name, among us, has left the light of his mind, to enlighten posterity. His essays of "Brutus," and his public speeches, will be read and admired in this country, as long as constitutional liberty is preserved among us.

Sententious Criticism.—The following satirical summary of the moral merits of some of the standard novelists, is from a new Magazine which has just been attempted by two of the sons of William Cobbett:

"Would you induce a wife? Falkland shall teach you to do it with gravity and dignity. Would you attract? Eugene Aram shall show you its necessity for the public advantage. Would you rob? Paul Clifford shall convince you of the injustice of security, and of the absurdity of the safety of a purse on a moonlight night. Would you eat? Turn with Harry Bertram and Dandy Dimont to the round of beef. Would you drink? Prior Tuck is the jolliest of companions. Would you dance, dance and draw! Pelham shall take you into tuition. Would you lie, fawn and flatter? Andrew Wylie shall instruct you to crawl upward, without the alms betraying your path. Would you yawn, doze, sleep or dream? Cloudsley shall do it for you, for the space of the first volume."

American Manufacture.—Our neighbor, Mr. J. D. Towns, has exhibited to us several pieces of the Georgia Nankeen, consigned to him for sale. It is manufactured from the real Nankeen Cotton, cultivated on the Estate of Senator Foxworth, of a color between a yellow and brown, and suitable for pantaloons. We advise our friends to try it as a fanciful, but a good substantial article.

Not. Intelligence.—The deaths of the Hon. Alexander Buckner, of Missouri, and of his wife, by Cholera, are announced in the Jackson Eagle. They died at their residence in the country, within 20 hours after the first symptoms of the disease. From the Missouri papers it appears that the pestilence is spreading through the country.

Death of Sir Archy.—We understand this highly celebrated horse, the property of John D. Amis, Esq., of Northampton County, Virginia, died a few days since, in the 31st or 32nd year of his age.

The wife of a Judge of the Supreme Court of Appeals at Konigsburg, in Prussia, was delivered on the 16th March last, of three male children, to which the father gave the christian names of Elacus, Mimos, and Rhadamanthus.

Professor Wright, of Hudson College, at the date of our last advices, was lecturing in Boston, on the subject of immediate emancipation. The Professor has a work in press upon the same subject.

THE CAROLINIAN.

PLAT JUSTITIA BUNT COLON.

SALISBURY:

JULY 15, 1833.

CANDIDATES IN ROWAN.

FOR THE SENATE.
THOMAS G. FOLK,
JOHN BEARD, Jr.

FOR THE COMMONS.
F. A. WARD,
HAMILTON C. JONES,
JOHN CLEMENT,
C. FISHER.

FOR THE BOROUGH.
BURTON CRAIG,
R. H. ALEXANDER.

FOR CLERK OF COUNTY COURT.
JOHN GILES,
A. R. JONES.

FOR CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT.
H. GILES,
ALEX. LONG.

FOR CONGRESS.

A. HENCHER—NO OPPOSITION.

ERRATA.

In reporting the Toast, drank at the late Anniversary Dinner, in this place, several mistakes occurred.—Many of them are so slight that the mistake will be easily corrected, but that of Mr. Smith was so erroneously printed, that we give it below.

By Henry Smith. The State Rights men of Salisbury: Great efforts are making to trample them down, but they will rise and flutter, in spite of all they can do.

The Rev. ALEXANDER ALBRIGHT, missionary for the annual conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, in North Carolina, will preach in Salisbury on Tuesday the 23rd inst.

ROBT. J. TULL—BULL.

In the great contest of Liberty which has recently agitated this country, but few men took a more conspicuous part than Robert J. Tull, of South Carolina. In many essays, and public speeches, he exposed with the hand of a master, and the spirit of a patriot, the daring usurpation of the Federal Government, and warned the people of the danger impending over them. During the whole contest, he stood forth, a heat within himself, as the champion of Freedom, and to but few, is the country more indebted for the preservation of the Constitution, than to him. This Patriot is no more. He died at his residence a few weeks ago, greatly regretted by the friends of civil liberty throughout the Union—but his good name, among us, has left the light of his mind, to enlighten posterity. His essays of "Brutus," and his public speeches, will be read and admired in this country, as long as constitutional liberty is preserved among us.

We commend the following observations, taken from Cobbett's Advice to a Young Man, to the readers of history generally. Young men, particularly to the readers of English history, they may be usefully applied to that of our own and every other country:

"Another mode of spending the leisure time is that of books. National and well-informed compassions may be still more instructive; but books never weary; they cost little; and they are always at hand, and ready at your call. The portion of books, must, in some degree, depend upon your pursuit in life; but there are some books necessary to every one who aims at the character of a well-informed man. I have slightly mentioned history and geography in the preceding letters, but I must here observe, that, as to both these, you should begin with your own country, and make yourself well acquainted, not only with its ancient state, but with the origin of all its principal institutions. To read of the battles which it has fought, and of the intrigues by which one king or one minister has succeeded another, is very little more profitable than the reading of a romance. To understand well the history of the country, you should first understand how it came to be divided into counties, hundreds, and into parishes; how judges, sheriffs, and justices first arose; to what end they were all invented, and how the changes with respect to any of them have been produced. But, it is of particular consequence that you should ascertain the state of the people in former times, which is to be ascertained by comparing the then price of labour with the then price of food. You hear enough, and you read enough, about the glories of the reign of King Edward the Third; and it is very proper that those glories should be recorded and remembered; but you never read, in the works of the historians, that, in that reign, a common labourer carried three pence half-penny a day, and that a fat sheep was sold at the same time, for one shilling and two-pence, and a fat hog, two shillings, for three shillings and fourpence, and a fat goose for twopence half-penny. You never read, that women received a penny a day for hay-making or weeding in the corn, and that a gallon of red wine was sold for fourpence. These are matters which historians have deemed to be beneath their notice; but, they are matters of real importance; they are matters which ought to have practical effect at this time; for they furnish the criterion whereby we are to judge of our condition compared with that of our forefathers. The record of a great feature in the laws and customs of this country. Put to a thousand persons who have read what is called the history of England; put to them the question, how the poor-rites came to be introduced, and nine-tenths of the thousand will tell you, that they know nothing at all of the matter. This is not history, and a list of battles and a string of intrigues are not history, they communicate no knowledge applicable to our present state; and it is really better to amuse oneself with an novel romance, which latter is a great deal worse than passing one's time in counting the trees."

Temperance.—On the 4th of July, 1833, at the 2nd anniversary meeting of the Jersey Settlement Temperance Society, the following resolution was offered, and unanimously adopted:

Whereas, it is evident that great and lasting evils arise from the practice pursued by candidates for public office of treating with intoxicating drink to procure public favor; and whereas, we cannot consistently with the principles of temperance we would inculcate, support such candidates for public favor; be it therefore Resolved, by the Jersey Settlement Temperance Society, that we refuse to support any candidate for public office in Rowan County, who is not a teetotaler, and who is not a resolution, not to treat either directly or indirectly, the voters of said county with any intoxicating drink, during the ensuing canvass for election.

Resolved, unanimously, that the foregoing resolution be published in the Western Carolinian, Valikin & Catawba Journal, and Carolina Watchman, printed at Salisbury.

E. B. ROBERTS, Sec'y.

To the Sheriffs of NORTH CAROLINA.

At a meeting held in the city of Raleigh, during the last session of our General Assembly, it was resolved to address the People of this State on the subject of reviving the Constitution, and to request the Sheriffs of the several counties to open a poll for taking the votes of the people "for or against a change of the Constitution" at the separate elections to be held in August 1833, for members of Assembly, and report the result to his excellency the Governor, a past compliance with this resolution the committee selected for that purpose have published "an address to the free men of North Carolina" in which the subject is fully, ably and candidly discussed. It is gratifying also to perceive, that the conductors of the public press, have in all parts of the State opened their columns to this subject, and lent their aid to circulate information, on this important question, so that few among us will have any difficulty in acting understandingly on it.

The undersigned as chairman of this meeting and in their behalf, now most respectfully requests the Sheriffs of this State to lend their assistance in procuring an expression of the public will, in the manner, indicated by the said resolution. True it is, that no law has armed this request, with the force of a mandate; but he has too much confidence in the intelligence, republican spirit, and courtesy of the Sheriffs of North-Carolina to believe they can slight a request of this sort, where it has emanated from so respectable a body of their fellow citizens. It is a request that you should lend your official aid to embody public opinion;—and you cannot fairly or decorously refuse it, for I apprehend you all will admit, that an acquiescence, can result, in no possible injury, unless indeed it be an evil, to permit the people of a free State to express their sentiments about public officers. Permit me to add, that an easy and uniform plan for notifying the people, that these polls will be opened, would be, that each Sheriff should advertise the fact in the newspapers (where a paper is published in his district) as well as by notices put up at public places in his county. In these notices however it is desired that the people should be distinctly informed that their opinion is asked, "for a change of the Constitution." It is believed, that if a majority be in favor of a change, the Legislature may be safely entrusted, with providing the plans, of procuring the change which are necessary, subject, however

to the ultimate determination of the people. The various plans which have been suggested, are chiefly limited with the principles and principles of the American States,—have been capriciously stated and discussed in the address before referred to, and their consideration does not properly belong to this communication. This method of addressing the Sheriffs of the State, has been adopted in preference to a letter by mail to each one, because the communication is more certain to reach their attention, and because it is much less liable to misapprehension. The meeting before referred to, had no hidden projects, and I have no concealment on their behalf.

The undersigned also expresses this opportunity of inviting the aid of the county committees (appointed last winter) in distributing the addresses, and other information, on this subject, among the people, and also in procuring a vote in their respective counties "for or against a change of the Constitution." The liberality already manifested by the conductors of the press, induces him to hope, that they may find it agreeable and convenient, to give publicity to this communication, by inserting it for two or three weeks in some conspicuous part of their journals.

Respectfully,
THOS. G. FOLK, CHM.

Rowan, 28th June, 1833.

FROM THE LEXINGTON (KY.) GAZETTE, OF June the 22nd.

THE CHOLERA.

The ravages of this terrific disease in our city, will be an ample apology for the failure of the Gazette for two weeks successively. After the first side of our paper of the 8th inst. had been struck off, the greater part of the hands in the office were attacked with the Cholera, and the rest were required to attend them. Further operations were therefore, necessarily suspended. The disease has greatly abated; but it is not yet deemed safe for those who have left the city to return. The sum total of deaths from the commencement of the disease up to this date, is most probably, about 400. We give below, a list of such as have been positively ascertained. The population of Lexington is about 6000—400 deaths will amount to one in fifteen of the inhabitants—a sad portion we believe, unequalled on this side of the Atlantic, if we except the city of Montreal, (and perhaps Quebec.)

TO THE PUBLIC.

ON the night of the 4th of July last, some person entered my house and stole out of my pocket a calf-skin or sheep-skin pocket-book, containing about one hundred and eighty dollars in bank bills, and also sundry Judge's warrants,—the contents of which, which the following are recollections, of what.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of John Woods vs. Effram Proctor for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of A. T. Tappan vs. Adam M. Graham for cash between \$30 or \$40.00, and a bond on Effram Proctor's behalf of property valued at \$500 or \$600.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. Torrence vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

TO THE PUBLIC.

ON the night of the 4th of July last, some person entered my house and stole out of my pocket a calf-skin or sheep-skin pocket-book, containing about one hundred and eighty dollars in bank bills, and also sundry Judge's warrants,—the contents of which, which the following are recollections, of what.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of John Woods vs. Effram Proctor for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of A. T. Tappan vs. Adam M. Graham for cash between \$30 or \$40.00, and a bond on Effram Proctor's behalf of property valued at \$500 or \$600.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. Torrence vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

A Judgment and Execution in favor of J. M. Ewell vs. J. M. Ewell for cash between \$25 or \$30.00.

